REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed February 28, 2006. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16 and 18-23 were pending in this Application. Claims 4, 11 and 17 were previously cancelled by Applicants without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16 and 18-23 were rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, 14-16, and 20-23

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, 14-16, and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,466,989 issued to Hslao-Wei Chu et al. ("Chu") in view of U.S. Patent 6,490,297 issued to Mark H. Kraml et al. ("Kraml"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art combination, even if proper, which Applicants do not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious. In order to make obvious Applicant's claimed invention, the references cited by the Examiner must disclose all claimed limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974).

Chu and Kraml do not teach an illumination signal.

Independent Claim 1 recites, among other steps "generating an illumination signal ... indicative of the cabling connection to be made." Emphasis added. Independent Claim 10 recites, among limitations, a program of instructions "operable to generate at least one illumination signal . . . indicative of a cabling connection to be made." Independent Claim 16 is directed to a computing system that includes, among other features, a computing component, "operable to generate at least one illumination signal . . . and to generate at least one illumination signal on the second computing component of a cabling connection to be made."

Examiner cites to the combination of Chu and Kraml as rendering obvious Independent Claims 1, 10 and 16. Specifically, Examiner cites to Chu as generating signals on the first and second computing components indicative of the cabling connection that is to

be made. The Chu reference is directed to a network connection device including an interface circuit, a switching array and a controlling circuit to make a connection between network terminals. *See* Col. 2, lines 16-27. More specifically:

> The method of operating the aforementioned network connection device for connecting to a network cable is as follows. First, as soon as the network connection device is physically connected to the wires inside a network cable, a signal is emitted from the controlling circuit to the switching array requesting that the positive receiving terminal and the negative receiver terminal of the interface circuit be connected to a pair of signal-carrying wires inside the cable. Next, the controlling circuit picks up the signals from the positive receiving terminal and the negative receiving terminal to determine if the polarity of the two wires are correctly made. If proper polarity is made, nothing changes.
>
> However, if the polarity of the wiring connection is incorrect, the controlling circuit signals the switching array to swap their connection. Thereafter, the controlling circuit sends a signal to the switching array so that the positive transmitting terminal and the negative transmitting terminal are connected to a pair of unattached wires inside the network cable. Subsequently, a packet is sent from the controlling circuit to the network cable through the positive transmitting terminal and the negative transmitting terminal. The controlling circuit then waits for an acknowledgement packet from the network cable through the positive receiving terminal and the negative receiving terminal. On receiving the acknowledgement packet regarding the polarity connection to the network cable, a proper controlling signal can be sent to the switching array. If the original connection is judged to be in error, wiring connections from the positive transmitting terminal and negative transmitting terminal to the wires inside the network cable can be swapped.

Col. 2, line 49-Col. 3, line 11. Emphasis added.

During a telephone discussion with counsel for Applicants, the Examiner indicated a reliance on the term "emit", as in "a signal is emitted from the controlling circuit," as supporting her contention that Chu discloses the provision of an "illumination signal" as recited in Claims 1, 10 and 16. Applicant submits that "emit", as used by Chu in discussing

the emission of a signal means "to send out" and provides no disclosure, teaching or suggestion with respect to an illumination signal. This interpretation is further supported by the nature and operation of the Chu device. Chu relates to a network connection device and a switching array that automatically (with no operator or user interaction) matches connected terminals and thus has no use for an illumination signal. In other words, the device of Chu does not teach or use an illumination signal--instead, digital or analog signals are sent (emitted) to different component to accomplish the desired switching.

Additionally Kraml also fails to disclose, teach or suggest generating an illumination signal as recited.

Chu and Kraml do not teach a signal indicative of a cabling connection "to be made."

As is clearly indicated by Chu, a signal to a control circuit is initiated only after a network connection device is connected to a network cable. As such, any signal generated cannot be indicative of a cabling to be made since the cabling in question has already been accomplished. The teachings of Chu are directed to first making a cabling connection and then utilizing a network connection device and a switching array to correctly match the connected terminals. Similarly, Kraml teaches the enablement of an existing channel of a multi-channel communication line to be used for the transmission of control signals.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination of Chu and Kraml are directed to management of existing connections and do not disclose, teach or suggest signals for showing a cabling connection "to be made" as recited.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Chu and Kraml fails to render obvious Independent Claims 1, 10, 16 and Claims 2-3, 6-9, 12, 14, 15 and 20, 23 which depend therefrom. Applicants request reconsideration, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and full allowance of Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, 14-16 and 20, 23.

Claims 5, 13, 18 and 19.

Claims 5, 13, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu and Kraml et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,761,294 issued to Shmuel

Shaffer et al. ("Shaffer"). Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants further submit that Claims 5, 13, 18 and 19 depend from claims that have been placed in condition for allowance, thereby obviating the present rejection. Applicants request reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections under §103 and full allowance of Claims 5, 13, 18 and 19.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicants believe there are no fees due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0383 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2548.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants

Brian E. Szymczak
Reg. No. 47,120

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
CUSTOMER NO. **23640**
512.322.2548
512.322.8383 (fax)

Date: 5/30/2006